

PROPOSAL EVALUATION

Integrated Regional Water Management Implementation Proposition 50, Chapter 8 IRWM Implementation Step 1

PIN: 5796
APPLICANT NAME: Northern California Joint Exercise of Powers
PROJECT TITLE: Sacramento Valley Integrated Regional Water Management Program
FUNDS REQUESTED: \$39,365,000
COST MATCH: \$ 4,456,950
TOTAL PROJECT COST: \$43,821,950

DESCRIPTION: This is a proposal to obtain funding to implement projects to assist in meeting the Sacramento Valley IRWMP regional objectives, which are: Increase water supply reliability and availability; Protect surface water rights and groundwater aquifers; Implement the Sacramento Valley Water Management Agreement; Make water available for strategic transfers; Improve water quality; Improve environmental conditions; and Improve quantity and timing of flows to the Delta.

Question: Consistency with Minimum IRWM Standards - This evaluation will focus on whether the applicant has demonstrated that the IRWM Plan meets the minimum standards.

Pass

Question: Consistency with IRWM Standards - Adopted IRWM Plan and Proof of Formal Adoption. Weighting factor is 1. 2

The applicant provides a draft IRWMP and states that it will be adopted by January 1, 2007.

Question: Consistency with IRWM Standards - Description of Region. Weighting factor is 1. 3

The IRWMP includes a good description of the region, major water related infrastructure, and major land-use division within the region. Mapping provided does not support the appropriateness of the region, since it does not cover the entire hydrological basin, and the discussion does not explain the discrepancies. The quantity and quality of water resources and important ecological process and environmental resources is discussed. However, social and cultural makeup of the regional community, important cultural and social values, and economic conditions and important trends are inadequately addressed.

Question: Consistency with IRWM Standards - Objectives. Weighting factor is 1. 3

Objectives for the IRWMP were clearly identified and the chronology and efforts were summarized and included in the IRWMP. The IRWMP identifies objectives as implementation of SVWMA Phase 8, protection of surface water rights, water transfers in and out of the basin, and insuring water supply. They were developed over the last 10 years through a series of water rights and water supply contracts negotiation, local partnership programs and discussions and consensus between local and regional interest. Although protecting groundwater aquifers and developing water management programs and projects were cited as one of the many objectives, groundwater management was not directly addressed. The IRWMP does not include the implementation of BMPs to reduce offsite movement of pollutants and decrease agricultural return flow.

Question: Consistency with IRWM Standards - Water Management Strategies and Integration. Weighting factor is 1. 4

The plan provided a detailed description of the strategies to be employed and identified strategies not applicable. A list of projects that would meet the strategies is provided, and the strategies are cross referenced with regional and statewide priorities. Discussion on their integration was primarily focused on water use efficiency and capturing unused resources to fulfill Phase 8 obligations. Add benefits of the water management integration also relate to increase the region's ability to tap currently unused resources and transfer mechanism to fulfill Phase 8 obligations.

Question: Consistency with IRWM Standards - Priorities and Schedule. Weighting factor is 1. 3

A suite of projects is identified in the IRWMP and they are screened based on the stated regional priorities. From this list, a subset of projects is identified and prioritized based on readiness to proceed. However, the IRWMP only addresses the short-term implementation priorities; long-term implementation is not clearly described. Responsiveness and monitoring of project implementation to address regional needs and objectives is not adequately described. The IRWMP does not describe a process for responding to regional change or how project sequencing might be modified based on responses.

PROPOSAL EVALUATION

Integrated Regional Water Management Implementation Proposition 50, Chapter 8 IRWM Implementation Step 1

Question: Consistency with IRWM Standards - Implementation. Weighting factor is 1.

3

A list of projects, with responsible agency, is included. The projects are divided into three tiers (funded, short-term, planning/long-term), and potential associated funding mechanisms are listed. Although a list of projects is identified with current start and tentative completion dates, the IRWMP does not demonstrate the linkages or interdependences of the projects, their economic and technical feasibility on a programmatic level, or the institutional structure that will ensure implementation. The applicant will monitor project implementation against the IRWMP goals and interface with the funding and local agencies. Project-level integration and interdependence are not explicitly described. The IRWMP includes only general examples of how various water management strategies could provide multiple benefits.

Question: Consistency with IRWM Standards - Impacts and Regional Benefits. Weighting factor is 1.

2

The IRWMP does not describe impacts and benefits in detail, and defers the investigation of environmental analysis to the CEQA/NEPA process. The advantages of a regional plan as opposed to individual local efforts are not described. The IRWMP claims that there are interregional benefits and impacts, however documentation is not provided. The IRWMP claims to provide DAC benefits without providing any specifics.

Question: Consistency with IRWM Standards - Technical Analysis and Plan Performance. Weighting factor is 1.

2

The IRWMP does not include a discussion of data, technical methods, and analysis used in the selection of water management strategies. It identifies various principles and guidelines that the IRWMP will adopt. The applicant briefly mentions data gaps. The description of the methods that will be used to measure plan/project performance is very general and does not go into specifics.

Question: Consistency with IRWM Standards - Data Management. Weighting factor is 1.

3

The applicant states that the majority of the data used in developing the IRWMP is available to the public and that the final IRWMP will identify recommendations for data management approaches and repositories. Existing data is public information, but the IRWMP does not identify how the public will obtain it. Support for statewide data needs was claimed, but specifics are not provided.

Question: Consistency with IRWM Standards - Financing. Weighting factor is 1.

4

Potential funding/financing will come primary from State grants and federal sources; additional local funding is also expected. The IRWMP mentions past uses of federal and State grant funding sources. Local agency financial contributions are expected to be in-kind services and are estimated to be 12 to 15% of project costs. The applicant did not identify the means to provide ongoing support and financing for O&M of implemented projects.

Question: Consistency with IRWM Standards - Relation to Local Planning & Sustainability. Weighting factor is 1.

2

The applicant states that a review of current and proposed land-use planning process will not begin until funding for its proposed IRWMP Planning Grant. The applicant was successful in securing that grant. Future work includes the following updates and refinements to the IRWMP: 1) integration of water management planning with land-use planning; 2) refinement of integrated water management for the region; 3) development of an integrated monitoring and assessment program; and 4) facilitation of public involvement, agency support and adoption of the IRWMP by local agencies. The IRWMP claims that there will be coordination with officials throughout the region.

Question: Consistency with IRWM Standards - Stakeholder Involvement & Coordination. Weighting factor is 1.

3

Existing stakeholder involvement and coordination was described in the application. The IRWMP includes a list of five different past and future activities. The applicant states that they will rely on public meetings of local agencies for stakeholder involvement. The IRWMP components will go through a public review before implementation. However, the IRWMP does not specifically identify how interested stakeholders will be identified and does not address environmental justice concerns.

Question: Funding Match. This evaluation will focus on whether the applicant has demonstrated the ability to meet the minimum funding match or has requested a waiver or reduction in the funding match.

Pass

PROPOSAL EVALUATION

Integrated Regional Water Management Implementation Proposition 50, Chapter 8 IRWM Implementation Step 1

Question: Description of Proposal. Weighting factor is 3.

12

The project descriptions are generally detailed. Specific information on the 20 individual projects is described well, including goals and technical information. However, references to supporting documentation are lacking and the application lacks detail regarding how other grant-funded activities are coordinated with the proposal. Environmental compliance is contingent upon completion of SVWMA EIR/EIS and details are not provided.

Question: Project Prioritization. Weighting factor is 2.

4

The applicant prioritizes the projects based on readiness to proceed and criteria for grant funding. Project prioritization is briefly addressed and the priorities are listed. Additional detail as to how the priorities were developed could have been provided. The projects were not prioritized against one another.

Question: Cost Estimate. Weighting factor is 1.

3

A cost estimate breakdown is not provided in Attachment 7. Details are included in the project descriptions in Attachment 6. A majority of the projects have environmental components which are not reflected in the work scope or schedule. Some of the projects have had prior funding expenditures and some have included detail estimates. There are some summation errors in the cost estimates. Due to the errors and omissions in the project cost estimates, reasonableness of the estimates could not be determined.

Question: Schedule. Weighting factor is 1.

3

Schedules were provided for each project contained in the proposal. The schedules are very general, only having four tasks. Several project schedules did not include environmental compliance components and does not correspond to the work tasks. The application lack detail regarding how each project schedule relates to or depends on other elements of the IRWMP or other projects.

Question: Need. Weighting factor is 2.

8

The applicant identified 3 main need categories: 1) increased water supply reliability to help urbanizing areas in the Sacramento Valley meet dry year demands; 2) assisting in meeting delta water quality objectives; and 3) increased system flexibility. The applicant identified several critical needs in the event the proposal is not implemented including: 1) the goals to help improve water quality in the Delta will not be met; 2) efforts to improve water quality in the Sacramento Valley will not be undertaken; and 3) water users in areas of the Sacramento Valley will remain exposed to frequent water shortages. Additionally, water needs in other areas of the State that could have been addressed though the IRWMP will remain unmet and the State's water system will not gain the flexibility this proposal may provide.

Question: Disadvantaged Communities. Weighting factor is 2.

4

The applicant provided a discussion on the region's MHI and did not request a funding reduction waiver. The applicant does not identify how individual projects will directly benefit DAC.

Question: Program Preferences. Weighting factor is 1.

3

The proposal may achieve several of the program preference, including providing multiple benefits, improving local and regional water supply reliability, and maintenance of water quality standard. However, due to the draft nature of the IRWMP and associated lack of implementation and long-term planning, it is unknown if these projects will accomplish these objectives.

TOTAL SCORE: 71
